

Reply to the Comments by B. Farid and A.M. Tsvelik, arXiv:0909.2886v1, and B. Farid, arXiv:0909.2887v1

J. Kokalj¹ and P. Prelovšek^{1,2}

¹J. Stefan Institute, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia and

² Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, University of Ljubljana, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

(Dated: February 19, 2010)

In the recent preprints [3, 4] the authors claim that conclusions on the violation of the Luttinger sum rule (LSR) as put forward in published papers by the present authors [1, 2] are false or at least not conclusive enough. It concerns the validity of the LSR within the Mott-Hubbard insulator as manifested in the 1D model of spinless fermions [1], and the Hubbard model on a triangular lattice [2]. We show below that arguments against the presented analysis are rather easily rejected while still the general question of the validity and breakdown of the LSR remains to be answered.

PACS numbers: 71.10.-w, 71.27.+a

The Luttinger theorem is clearly an essential pillar on which the Fermi liquid theory for metals rests. Recently the extensions of the Luttinger sum rule (LSR) to insulators has been proposed as well as the possibility of the breakdown of the LSR has been considered by several authors. In our recent paper [1] we have shown that for the simple one-dimensional (1D) tight-binding model of interacting spinless fermions t - V the LSR can be broken within the Mott-Hubbard insulating phase provided that the electron-hole symmetry is broken via the introduction on the next-nearest-neighbor (n.n.n.) hopping t' . In a long and exhaustive Comment B.Farid and A.M. Tsvelik [3], which we are able to follow only partially, give several arguments why our analysis is not correct and the LSR remains in fact valid if interpreted properly. Below we go through the arguments as they follow:

1) The proper definition of the chemical potential μ as the zero- T limit of $\mu(T \rightarrow 0)$ is essential for the proof of the LSR and its validity whereby we agree with the Comment [3]. We are fully aware of this requirement and follow it everywhere therefore do not understand why we are cited on p.2 as “not to have appreciated this fundamental aspect”.

2) We agree with the Comment that LSR should apply also to finite-size systems which facilitates the discussion of the validity as well as possible breakdown of the LSR.

3) In Comment, p.3., it is claimed that our numerical results do not really show the violation of the LSR and that the whole argument is (essentially) based on delicate scaling of finite-size results. This is not true, since even at fixed large sizes we get direct evidence for violation. E.g., for $V/t = 8$ and results obtained on $N = 26$ sites on Fig.2 it is evident for discrete $k_1 = 7\pi/13 > \pi/2$ $G(k_1, \omega = 0) \sim 0$ being quite evident deviation from LSR. Even more, results for $N = 30$ (not presented in the paper) show for the same parameter $V/t = 8$ already for $k_2 = 8\pi/15$ $G(k_2, \omega = 0) > 0$, directly violating LSR on a finite-size system. We should also stress that the deviations from LSR as evident in Fig. 5 are quite substantial for $t'/t = 0.4$ reaching up to 10% well beyond any numerical uncertainty.

4) In the Comment the authors present a toy-model example which should indicate possible inaccuracies or failure of

finite-size scaling. It is, however, evident that the form as shown in their Fig.1 is quite pathological with $G(k, \mu)$ having the zero at $k = \pi/2$ but at the same time a near divergency or pole at $|k| < \pi/2$. This pole in fact fully appears for their parameter $A = 1.97$ very close to cases presented in the text. So very strong k variation is understandably the origin of delicate size dependence and poor scaling (in fact their scaling works still very well for $A = 1.6$ as presented in their Fig.1 and gives $k = \pi/2$ to high accuracy). On the other hand, our form of $G(k, \mu)$ vs. k as shown in Fig. 2 is very modest and even monotonous, at least for the case with a pronounced gap, i.e. $V/t \geq 4$ as analysed also in Figs. 3-5.

5) The possibility of a ordered state of charge-density-wave (CDW) type as mentioned on p.6 is clearly of relevance. However, the ordered state can appear only in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ while in all finite systems the ground state still has not broken translational invariance with $k = 0$. Since our results show substantial deviations of the LSR they appear already much before the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. Also it should be pointed out that the long-range order does not necessarily invalidate the LSR but merely needs a redefinition of the latter as correctly pointed out in the Comment.

In the other Comment [4] the author claims that the results for the Hubbard model on a triangular lattice indicating the violation of the LSR for $U/t \gg 1$ [2] are erroneous. This is somewhat surprising since the author follows in detail our original steps in the analytical expansion for $t/U \ll 1$ and does not find any inconsistencies in our analysis. Only on his p.3 (after Eq. (28)) he claims that there is a ‘fallacy in the reasoning’ although it is hard to establish the exact objection:

1) It seems that the author starts from the assumption in the limit of $t/U \rightarrow 0$ the LSR should hold? However, the latter limit is far from trivial, and there is no guarantee for LSR, or even more the LSR appears to fail rather evidently as shown in our paper [2]. Moreover, certain caveats (as pointed out in our analysis) are also necessary for strictly $U/t \rightarrow \infty$ since the ground state can become of different symmetry (large S), at least for small systems.

2) The author [4] seems to object to the expansion in the deviation $\tilde{\mu}$. It is true that the latter quantity we are not able

to derive analytically (in contrast to $G(\mathbf{k}, \mu_0)$) still numerical results for different sizes (in Fig. 1) clearly give a consistent scaling.

3) Author in his Comment [4] estimates the discrepancy between our first order approximation (in t_{ij}/U expansion) of the Luttinger wave vector $k_L^{(1)}$ and exact Luttinger wave vector k_L with the order of $\tilde{\mu}$,

$$k_L^{(1)} - k_L \sim \tilde{\mu} = O(t_{ij}). \quad (1)$$

k_L (following from $G(k_L, \mu) = 0$) would hypothetically be obtained with taking into consideration all orders of large U expansion, but would not necessarily satisfy the LSR. This leads him to the conclusion that [4]

$$\frac{G^{(0,2)}(\mathbf{k}_L^{(1)}; U/2)}{G^{(1,0)}(\mathbf{k}_L; \mu)} = O\left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}}\right). \quad (2)$$

This two estimates seems rather ambiguous considering the dimensional analysis and we show that within the t_{ij}/U expansion they are false. Both, numerator and denominator can within the strong coupling expansion be easily estimated. With the use of Eqs. 4, 7 and 14 in reference [2] one obtains for the numerator $G^{(0,2)}(\mathbf{k}_L^{(1)}; U/2) = O(t_{ij}/U^4)$ and

with the use of Eq. 16 in reference [2] one readily sees that $G^{(1,0)}(\mathbf{k}_L; \mu) = O(t_{ij}/U^2)$. All together gives the true estimate for the discrepancy

$$k_L^{(1)} - k_L \sim O\left(\frac{t_{ij}^2}{U^2}\right), \quad (3)$$

which can actually be quantitatively estimated using quantities presented in [2] with much less than 1%.

In conclusion, considering in detail the Comments [3, 4] we did not find any criticism of our analysis [1, 2] to be founded. Still we agree with the author that the LSR and its possible violation should be considered very carefully and that this subject and its consequences are of fundamental importance for the solid state physics and correlated systems in particular.

-
- [1] J. Kokalj and P. Prelovšek, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 153103 (2008).
 - [2] J. Kokalj and P. Prelovšek, Eur. Phys. J. B **63**, 431 (2008).
 - [3] B. Farid and A. M. Tsvelik, arXiv:0909.2886v1 (2009).
 - [4] B. Farid, arXiv:0909.2887v1 (2009).